

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 through 7, 15 through 19, and 21 are pending, with Claims 1, 6, 7, 15, 17 through 19, and 21 being independent. Claims 8 through 14 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 through 7, 15 through 19, and 21 have been amended.

Claims 1-10, 13, 14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0249919 A1 to Mattheis. Claims 1-10, 13-15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0083431 A1 to Machida. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0249919 A1 to Mattheis in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0184304 A1 to Meade, II et al. ("Meade, II"). Claims 15, 16, 17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0249919 A1 to Mattheis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,854 B1 to Fleming, III.

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, Claims 8 through 14 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejections of these claims.

In addition, Applicant is submitting sworn translations of the priority documents to remove the Mattheis citation as a reference, since the filing dates of two of these priority documents are before the filing date of the Mattheis citation and these two priority documents support the currently amended claims. Therefore, all the rejections involving the Mattheis citation are now considered moot in view of this submission, e.g., the rejection of Claims 1-10,

13, 14, 19 and 20 as anticipated by the Mattheis citation, the rejection of Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Mattheis in view of Meade, II, and the rejection of Claims 15, 16, 17, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Mattheis in view of Fleming, III. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Further, in response to the remaining rejection over the Machida citation, independent Claims 1, 6, 7, 15, 17 through 19, and 21 have been amended. Applicant submits that as amended, these claims are allowable at least for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 relates to an information processing method comprising designation, search, and distribution steps.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the method relates to a method executed in an information processing apparatus which distributes across a network a printer driver program for controlling a printing device to a client apparatus for managing the printing device. Claim 1 also been amended to recite that the designation step designates range information for searching for a printing device connected to the network. Claim 1 has further been amended to recite that the search step searches for the printing device which is controlled by installing the printer driver program to the client apparatus and corresponds to the designated range information. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the distribution step distributes a printer driver program, from the information processing apparatus to the client apparatus, for managing the printing device within the range searched in the search step.

As a result, what is designated for searching in the designation step and what is searched for in the searching step is a printing device, rather than the client apparatus.

In contrast, the citation to Machida is not understood to disclose or suggest a designation step that designates range information for searching for a printing device connected to the network, a search step that searches for the printing device which is controlled by installing the printer driver program to the client apparatus and corresponds to the designated range information, or a distribution step that distributes a printer driver program, from the information processing apparatus to the client apparatus, for managing the printing device within the range searched in the search step, as recited by amended Claim 1. Rather, the Machida citation is understood to disclose the setting up of a driver when the driver of a peripheral device of a network is not installed. In addition, page 8 of the Office Action cites Figure 7 and paragraph [0083] of this publication to show the searching for “client units” but Figure 7 itself identifies these client units as personal computers (“PC’s”), rather than printers. In addition, while paragraph [0071] of this publication states that a device managing module “obtains the connection status information for the PCs and the peripheral devices”, there is not understood to be any disclosure of designating range information for searching for a printing device connected to a network, as recited by amended Claim 1. Thus, this citation is not understood to disclose or suggest a designation step that designates range information for searching for a printing device connected to the network, or a search step that searches for a printing device which is controlled by installing the printer driver program to a client apparatus and corresponds to designated range information, as recited by amended Claim 1.

Since amended Claim 1 is understood to recite at least one feature not disclosed or suggested by the citation to Machida, Applicant submits that the Office has not yet satisfied its

burden of proof to establish the anticipation of amended Claim 1 over this citation. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 1 be withdrawn. And because independent Claims 6, 7, 15, 17 through 19, and 21 have been amended in a similar manner, they are submitted to be allowable for similar reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claims 6, 7, 15, 17 through 19, and 21 be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given for the independent claims and because they recite features that are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

---

Gary M. Jacobs  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
GMJ/DSG/jjr